



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

speaks of our law of divorce, which allows of the "marrying her that is put away." The fact is, our law of divorce does not allow the separated parties to marry. And it is by no means our business to discuss the merits of acts of parliament which have occasionally been passed in particular cases giving divorces of a nature which the Ecclesiastical Courts of the Church of England refuse.

We do not reject "transubstantiation," because the word is not found in the Scriptures. If Mr. Aylmer can prove us the doctrine from Scripture, we shall not quarrel about the word. We adopt the words "Trinity" and "consubstantial," because they express distinctly and concisely the Scriptural doctrines as opposed to the Arian corruptions; but we do not say that the use of these words is essential to salvation, for we know that, in the first two centuries, there were thousands of saints who, indeed, held the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, but who died before these words, "Trinity" and "consubstantial," were introduced.

(25) Mr. Aylmer denies that all the thirty-nine articles can be directly proved from Scripture. We have again to remind him that it is only *articles of faith*, the belief of which is necessary to salvation, which we assert to be exclusively contained in Holy Scripture. All the thirty-nine articles do not relate to such articles of faith; but those which do, we receive because we believe them capable of Scriptural proof.

The only point in Mr. Aylmer's letter which it now remains for us to notice, is the fact that the Prayer Book version of the 14th Psalm (as well as the Roman Catholic versions) contains three or four verses more than are found in the common authorized version. It should be mentioned, however, that these verses are found elsewhere in the Bible. It is plain that the revisers of the Church of England Liturgy did not consider this transposition a very important variation, or they would not have retained in the Prayer Book the use of the more ancient translation of the Psalms. Roman Catholic divines, however, have fastened on this trifling disagreement with earnestness almost ludicrous; and while not scrupling to allow the Scriptures to remain unknown to the majority of their laity, speak as if they believed that the awful curses denounced against any who should presume to add to the Word of God, were incurred by a copyist who should misplace a verse or two in his transcription.

With regard to these verses the state of the case is this:—The verses in question are not now found, we believe, in any copy of the Hebrew. They are found in most copies of the Septuagint Greek translation. Accordingly they do not appear in the Bible version, which was made directly from the Hebrew; they do appear in the Prayer-book version, which (like modern Roman Catholic versions) is a translation of a translation. Now, it is a curious critical question, whether it be more likely that these words have dropped out of all copies of the Hebrew, or that they have been inserted into some copies of the Septuagint. But it is not an important religious question, because the words are confessedly inspired, being used by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, chap. iii. Even, then, if we suppose that the Prayer-book version errs, in company with those of the Church of Rome, we must admit that the error is a very unimportant one, and that, if the Church of Rome had been guilty of none more serious, we should not have been justified in leaving her communion.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Finding it impossible, from its great length, to insert the letter of the Rev. R. A. Wilson, we have forwarded it to the Rev. W. Carson, to whom it was addressed.

We have to apologize also to several valued correspondents for postponing communications addressed to ourselves, but which we hope to print in our next number.

In reply to our Kingstown correspondent, we beg to say that we have applied to the Rev. Dr. Murray of Maynooth, for permission to reprint his reply to the Archbishop of Dublin's essay on Infallibility; should we obtain his leave, we purpose commencing the subject in our next number.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Subscriptions are earnestly solicited, which our friends will observe are payable in advance. The amount may be forwarded either in postage stamps or a post-office order, payable to Mr. Wm. Curry, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JULY, 1852.

THE USE OF "THE FATHERS" IN PROVING THE NOVELTY OF ERRORS.

IN the course of our remarks on the use of the Fathers, in our last number, we stated our opinion, that the Fathers were "above all value in enabling us to convict of novelty the errors which have arisen in the church since their times," of which we undertook to give an example in our next. We now proceed to fulfil our promise; and take as our instance the doctrine of praying to saints and angels.

It is admitted by all learned Roman Catholic conversationalists, that saints and angels were not prayed to nor invoked under the Old Testament dispensation. It is also generally admitted by them, that praying to saints and angels is not taught in the New Testament. We give one instance of the latter admission, from Salmeron, a very learned Jesuit—"The Scriptures which were made and published in the primitive church, ought to found (or to lay the foundation of) and to explain Christ, who by the *tacit* (or *silent*, which *admits* that the Spirit did *not say it*) suggestion of the Spirit, did bring the saints with him; and it *would have been a hard matter* to command this to the Jews; and to the Gentiles, an *occasion would be given thereby* (that is, by teaching the worship of saints and angels in the New Testament) to think that *many gods* were put upon them, instead of the multitude of gods whom they had forsaken."—Salmeron, in 1 Tim., cap. 2, disput. 8.

We think the learned Jesuit has, in the above passage, very fairly admitted and accounted for the fact, that this doctrine was not taught in the New Testament; and we fully agree with him, that it would, if contained in the Sacred Writings, have been a great stumbling-block to the Jews, who were taught to worship God only, and also that the Gentiles would have taken it as a plain approbation of their former practice of worshipping dead men. But supposing the doctrine itself to be a true doctrine of the Gospel (and such Salmeron supposes it to be), we are at a loss to know how the Apostles could thus agree to hide it, for fear of creating offences, and teaching actual idolatry. This does not seem to have been the practice of the Apostles. They did not hide the doctrines of the Gospel, for fear men should take offence at them. Nor did they fear that the true Gospel of Christ should make men idolaters. Nor do we see how this notion of their concealing such doctrines, upon such reasons, can be reconciled with St. Paul's declaration to the Ephesians (who had been heathens and idolaters)—"I have kept back nothing that was profitable to you, but have preached it to you, and taught you publicly, and from house to house" (Acts, ch. 20, v. 20, Douay Bible); and v. 27—"I have not spared to declare unto you ALL the counsel of God." Now, if St. Paul preached this doctrine of praying to saints and angels to these heathen idolaters, "from house to house," it would have produced all the evils of idolatry, which Salmeron admits would have followed from teaching it in the New Testament Scriptures; and if St. Paul did *not* teach it to them, it is clear he did *not* think that it was profitable for them, or that it was any part of "the counsel of God."

But our present business with it is this:—It is agreed on both sides, that this doctrine is *not* taught in either the Old or the New Testament, and, therefore, that it is not taught in the Bible at all. Therefore, if it *was* part of the Apostles' doctrine, it has come down to us by tradition

alone. Here, then, comes in "the use of the Fathers;" for we suppose it will be admitted, that if the Fathers, for FOUR HUNDRED YEARS after Christ, have never mentioned this doctrine, except to condemn and to censure it, and to show that it was not *then* any part of the faith of the church—it will be admitted that this doctrine has *not* come down *through them* from the Apostles, but that it must be an invention of later times.

We propose, therefore, to illustrate this "use of the Fathers" of the first four centuries after Christ, by showing what they have said of this doctrine.

Our first witness is St. Ignatius, the martyr. He was known in the early church by another name, "Theophorus." This was a Greek word, signifying—"carried by Christ." Some have related, that he took this name from having been one of the children whom Christ took up in his arms and laid his hands upon and blessed; we know not whether this is true, but *it is possible*, for he was made bishop of the important See of Antioch by the Apostles, about the year 70 (40 years after the death of Christ), and he suffered death for the confession of Christ, about the year 110. In his epistle to the Philadelphians, written shortly before his death, we find these words—"Ye virgins, have *Christ alone before your eyes*, and his Father, *in your prayers*, being enlightened by the Spirit."*

Now, this is not the doctrine which is taught to "virgins" in the Roman Church of this day; they are taught to keep the Blessed Virgin and "St. Joseph," and many others, *before their eyes in their prayers*.

St. Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, and Bishop of Smyrna, also suffered martyrdom about the year 147. In the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, we have an epistle written by the Church of Smyrna, giving an account of his death. They relate that the Jews insisted that his dead body should not be given up to the Christians, for fear "they should begin to worship this man." On which the epistle observes—"Being ignorant that it is not possible that we should ever forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all who shall be saved of the whole world, OR THAT WE SHOULD WORSHIP ANY OTHER. For him indeed we worship, as being the Son of God; but the martyrs we deservedly love, as the disciples and followers of our Lord."—Euseb. Ed. Valesii, Mogunt. 1672. Book iv, ch. 15.

The great Athanasius, writing against the Arians (Oratio III.) says—"No man would pray to receive anything from the Father, *and the angels, or any other creatures*, neither would any man say, 'God and the angels give me this.'" If St. Athanasius had lived in these days, he might have learned differently. "God and the Blessed Virgin preserve me," or "God and the angels protect me," is not now thought amiss; yet Athanasius says that no Christian in his day would have said such a thing.

And even those Fathers of whose errors we are warned, are useful in this inquiry. For instance, Origen, whom (on the authority of St. Vincent) we have held up as a warning, agrees in condemning this doctrine—"All prayers and

* We do not undertake to affirm that these words were written by Ignatius. The words are in the old copies of his letters, received as true for centuries; but they are not in the new editions of that letter, since the discovery of the Alexandrian Codex. We would not quote the words at all, but for this reason: if the words were *not* written by Ignatius, they were put into his works in later times by some one else. Now, whenever this was done, it was clearly not thought to be contrary to the doctrine of the church at that time. If a denial of the Trinity had been put into Ignatius's writings, every one would have said—"Ignatius could not have written that;" but the church did *not* say it of the words in question. So, in fact, this makes the proof stronger; for it shows that these words were not considered contrary to church doctrine when inserted in later times, if it were so.

supplications, and intercessions and thanksgivings, are to be sent up unto God, the Lord of all, *through the High Priest*, who is above all angels, being the Living Word and God. For to call upon angels, we not comprehending the knowledge of them, which is above the reach of man, is *not agreeable to reason*."—Origen, Lib. 5, Tom. 1, p. 580. Tertullian, too, whom St. Vincent also holds up as a warning, holds the same doctrine, in a book written while he was a Catholic (Apolog. ch. 30. Ed. Rigalt, p. 27. Paris, 1675); he says—These things "I may not pray for from any other but from him of whom I know I shall obtain them, because both he it is who alone is able to give, and *I am he to whom it belongs to obtain them*." Clearly Tertullian did not hold the doctrine, that it belonged to the saints and angels to obtain his petition for him. And yet, neither Origen nor Tertullian were ever, in their own times, or we believe since, accused of error or heresy for writing the above, which, doubtless, they would have been, had they not expressed truly what the church at that time believed upon the subject.

Even the heretics who separated from the church in those days, are witnesses that they never heard of this doctrine. Novatian, who separated from the church, and established a new sect, about the year 248, held for the most part the same doctrine as the church. He wrote a book in defence of the Divinity of Christ, in which he thus argues—"If Christ be only man, how is he present whenever he is called upon, since this is not the nature of man, but of God, that he can be present in every place? If Christ be man only, why is a man invoked as mediator in our prayers, since the mediation of a man is judged ineffectual to affording salvation? If Christ be only man, why is our hope placed in him, since hope in man* is called cursed?"—(Novat. in Trin., c. 14. In Tertullian's works, as above quoted, p. 715.) Of course we do not quote this as if whatever Novatian said must be true; we do not so rely on even the most orthodox Fathers. But we have quoted those orthodox Fathers above mentioned, to show that they did not know of any such doctrine of the church in their day as praying to saints and angels, and, therefore, that it cannot have been handed down *through them* as an Apostolic tradition. We quote Origen and Tertullian to show that even erring Fathers knew nothing of it. We quote Novatian to show that separatists from the church knew nothing of it. In this respect, they are all useful witnesses, and as such we use them. Even forgeries may confirm this proof. If the passage which we have quoted as Ignatius's be not really his—if it were forged in later times, and fathered upon him, this only proves that in that later time, whenever it was, even the forger had not learned to dream of Christians keeping angels and saints before their eyes in their prayers.

We have yet one point more to illustrate. We spoke in our last article of the *speculations* of individual Fathers. These, too, may be a valuable proof that the things they so speculated about were no part of the church's doctrine or faith in their days. This brings us to Gregory Nazianzen, who wrote his first invective against Julian about the year 361—"Hear, O thou soul of great Constantine, *IF THOU HAST any understanding of these things*." And again, in his funeral oration (Oratio 11) for Gorgonia—"IF THOU HAST any care of the things done by us, and if holy souls receive this honour from God, that they have any feeling of such things as these, receive this oration," &c. Can any one believe that Gregory would have written thus, if he believed it to be a part of *the faith of the church* that holy souls do really hear what we address to them? He ventures to address them

as one who does not know, and cannot tell, whether they hear or not; and this very address is the strongest proof that it was *not the faith and belief of the church* in his day that the souls do hear when we call upon them.

We have now gone over *every passage*; in the Fathers of the *first four centuries*, that relates to this subject. There is no shadow of grounds to suppose that, up to the year 364, any one of them ever dreamed of praying to saints or angels. Every one of them who alluded to the subject, up to that year, did so only to censure and condemn it; and the first who inclines to it at all shows us, by the way he does it, that he does not do it in conformity with the faith of the church.

If we have passed over any passage, in the Fathers of these four hundred years, which gives any support to prayers to saints or angels, we suppose some one can show it. It is our conviction that no one can; and, if so, are we not entitled to ask, how can any one believe that prayer to saints or angels was "a tradition of the Fathers," during these four centuries? And if it gradually arose in later times, how can it be an "apostolic tradition," or part of the Apostles' doctrine? Is not this a fair instance of "the use of the Fathers," in convicting of novelty the errors that have arisen since their days?

We trust that our readers will now see that if we refuse to take "the Fathers" as the rule of our faith, it is *not* because we suppose them to be unfavourable to the doctrines we hold; neither is it because we are unwilling or unable to use them aright, as helps for discovering the truth; but simply because we will not use an unsound rule of faith, even in support of truth; because, in things of such vast importance to the souls and the faith of men, we feel constrained to seek only for a sound, an infallible rule of faith, for ourselves and for others.

KILKENNY—ANONYMOUS CHALLENGE.

THE following challenge, without any name to it, or any clue to the person who wrote it, or any direction in what way an answer could be given to that person, was slipped under the house door of a Scripture reader in Kilkenny. It has been sent to us, in hopes that the answer may reach the person who gave it. We trust that Roman Catholics, generally, will not approve of so mean a way of giving a challenge. Let those who can discuss the subject come forward and do so like men, in the light of day, and they will be fairly and honestly met:—

"CHALLENGE.

"May 18, 1852.

"It will not be denied but that the Church of Rome was once a most pure, excellent, flourishing, and mother church.—Rom. i. 8, chs. vi. and xvi. White's defence of his way, pp. 43, 44. King James in his speech to the Parliament. Whittaker in his answer to Dr. Sand, 2 Demonstrat. Falkin, c. 2, 2 Thess. s. 7. Reynolds in his fifth conclusion.

"This church could not cease to be such; but she must fall either by *Apostasy, Heresy, or Schism*.

"I. *APOSTASY* is not only a renouncing of the faith of Christ, but the very name and title of Christianity. No man will say that the Church of Rome had ever such a fall, or fell thus.

"II. *HERESY* is an adhesion to some private and singular opinion or error in faith contrary to the generally-approved doctrine of the church. If the Church of Rome did ever adhere to any singular or new opinion, disagreeable to the commonly-received doctrine of the Christian world, I pray satisfy me as to these particulars—viz., 1st—By what general council was she ever condemned? 2nd—Which of the Fathers ever wrote against her? 3rd—By what authority was she otherwise reprov'd? for it seems to be a thing very incongruous that so great a church should be condemned by every one that hath a mind to condemn her.

"III. *SCHISM* is a departure or division from the unity of the church, whereby the bond and communion held with some former church is broken and dissolved. If ever the Church of Rome divided herself by *schism* from any other body of faithful Christians, or broke communion, or went forth from the society of any elder church, I pray satisfy me as to these particulars: 1st—Whose company did she leave? 2nd—From what body did she go forth? 3rd—Where was the true church which she forsook? Pause on these three words; for it appears a little strange to me that a church should be accounted schismatical, when there cannot be assigned

any other church different from her, which from age to age since Christ his time has continued visible, from which she departed.

"To the Bible Readers
"at James's-street, Kilkenny."

I. The challenger thinks there cannot be *apostasy* from the faith of Christ without renouncing "the very name and title of Christianity." Take the Socinians, who "deny the Lord that bought them." These men do not renounce "the name and title of Christianity;" and, therefore, according to this challenger, they have not apostatized from the faith of Christ! And we suppose they are still Catholics! We do not wonder that this challenge was given in the dark, so that it could not be answered.

11. The challenger evidently thinks that the majority of professing Christians, at any one time, *must* be Catholics, and the minority heretics—as if the truth of doctrine depended on counting heads. It is hardly worth while to answer this, except by counting heads to convict the challenger himself of heresy. For Rome is in a minority at this day. To acknowledge the Pope is with her an article of faith at this day—and the whole Greek Church, including all the churches of the vast empire of Russia, as well as Greece and Turkey, all the churches of England, America, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, &c., and all Protestant sects, reject her, far exceeding in number those who obey her.

But it is not true that we must follow the majority. A great Catholic doctor (acknowledged as such by the Church of Rome herself), St. Vincent of Lerins, who wrote his "Commonitory against Heresy" in the year 434, undertakes to tell us what we should do "if some new infection goeth about to corrupt, not a little part, but the whole church"—ch. 3. And he gives us an instance of it too in ch. 4—"When the poison of the Arians had now infected not a little part, but well nigh the whole world, in such sort that (almost all the bishops of the Latin tongue deceived, partly by force, partly by fraud) men's minds were covered as it were with a mist, what in so great a confusion was to be followed? Then, whosoever was truly a lover and a follower of Christ, by preferring ancient faith before new error, was untouched with any spot of that infection."

The same argument which makes the challenger a Romanist now, would have made him an Arian then!

We adopt St. Vincent's conclusion, "to call those *anathema* which teach otherwise than once hath been received, was never otherwise than needful, is everywhere needful, and ever shall be needful."—See Gal. ch. 1, v. 8, 9, Douay Bible.

And this is true, although error should be in the majority, as Arianism was then.

The challenger asks, by what general council was the Church of Rome ever condemned? We answer, by the general Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, which condemned any who should afterwards make a new creed, which the Church of Rome did in 1564; and many other instances we could give.

He asks, "Which of the Fathers ever wrote against her?" We answer, *all of them*. For there is, perhaps, not one of the Fathers that has not written against some or all of the errors that she now holds.

III. If the Church of Rome in the Apostles' days had refused to hold Christian communion with the Church of Corinth, or any other church, she would plainly have been guilty of schism. She now refuses to hold communion with the Greek Church (which is as old as herself), the English (nearly as old), and all those we have mentioned above. If she has no just cause for this refusal, she is guilty of schism now. And what is the cause? The English Church is willing to hold communion with the Church of Rome, in all the articles of the ancient Catholic creed, which has come down from the Apostles' times; and in all other things that are lawful by God's Word. The Church of Rome will hold no communion with the English Church or the Greek Church, unless they will profess the Creed of Pope Pius IV., made 1500 years after Christ. Which is guilty of the schism? If in the Apostles' days the Church of Rome had brought out the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and refused to hold communion with any church that held to the Apostles' Creed and that alone, would she not have been guilty of schism? And is she not guilty of schism now, for doing the same?

Correspondence.

IS THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY TAUGHT BY THE EARLY FATHERS?

SIR—I am just after reading, in your last number, a letter from an anonymous correspondent, requesting some Catholic priest or layman to publish the opinions of the Fathers, who lived in the three first centuries, in favour of Purgatory.

I at once proceed to meet the wishes both of yourself and correspondent; with all due regard, however, to the limited space afforded by your periodical.

I do approve of persons going back to *first principles*, and slaking their thirst for knowledge in those fountains which are near its source.

1. To begin at the beginning: I find it recorded, in

* See Jeremiah, ch. 17, v. 5, Douay Bible, to which Novatian seems here to have referred.